



**MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE  
PATENT**

**IN THE U.S. PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant(s):	Farbod ARAM et al.	Conf. No.:	6378
Application No.:	<b>10/601,286</b>	Group Art Unit:	2831
Filed:	June 20, 2003	Examiner:	Ha, Nguyen T.
For:	<b>FRINGING CAPACITOR STRUCTURE</b>		
Attorney Docket No.:	MP0074.C1		

---

**COMMENTS ON REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE**

**MAIL STOP ISSUE FEE**  
Commissioner For Patents  
P.O. BOX 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

March 5, 2004

Sir:

In reply to the Notice of Allowance mailed December 5, 2003, the following comments are submitted in connection with the above-identified application.

**REMARKS**

Claims 21-43 remain allowed in connection with the present application.

In the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance, the Examiner makes separate statements regarding each of three claim groups, corresponding to each of independent claims 21, 31 and 39. The Examiner refers to some of the language present in each of the claims, and in some instances utilizes language which is not present in any of the claims of the present application (mostly due to minor typographical errors). As Applicants' claims should be limited only by the terms utilized therein, Applicant hereby submits these Comments on the Examiner's

Reasons for Allowance in an effort to ensure that the claims are properly construed based only upon limitations present therein.

For example, the Examiner initially states that with respect to claims 21-30, that the prior art does not teach the limitation of a “matched capacitor”. While Applicants do not dispute the allowability of claim 21 and all claims dependent thereon, Applicants note that claim 21 is directed to “Matched capacitors”. Further, the Examiner refers to “two spot capacitors” instead of “two split capacitors” of claim 21; and “a first one of the fringing capacitors” instead of “a first one of the fringing capacitors—of claim 21. Finally, with respect to claims 31-38, the Examiner states that the prior art does not teach the limitation of “a matched capacitor” instead of “Matched capacitors—as set forth in claim 31. While these are probably only minor typographical errors in the Examiner’s statement of Reasons for Allowance, Applicants hereby submit these comments in an effort to ensure that the claims are interpreted only based upon the actual limitations present therein.

Accordingly, Applicants hereby submit these comments in an effort to ensure that the claims are not unduly limited in any way by the statements made by the Examiner and to ensure that the claims are interpreted only based upon the actual limitations present therein.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C

**Please address all correspondence to:**

**MARVELL SEMICONDUCTOR, INC.  
Intellectual Property Department  
700 First Avenue, Mail Stop 509  
Sunnyvale, CA 94089**

By: 

Donald J. Daley, Reg. No. 34,313

P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195  
(703) 668-8000